

Relationship of Character and Temperament on the Organisational Culture, Organisational Justice and Ethical Conduct

by Orhan Mollasalih
Near East University, Cyprus

by Nermin Gürhan
Gazi University Faculty of Health Sciences, Ankara, Turkey

by Bahadır Geniş
Gazi University, Ankara, Turkey

Abstract

All living beings are in need of living in, and acting together with the members of, a group or a community in order to meet their desires and needs. These communities and groups, on the other hand, need leaders to lead and direct them to achieve a harmonious co-existence and to create a community that enjoys success. The characters and temperaments of the leaders play a role of great importance in that whether or not they can, for example, empower the humans in society and achieve a flourishing community. The main purpose of this study is to determine whether there is a relationship between the character and temperament of an individual with his/her leadership aspects. In this study that was conducted in relational screening model, we used socio-demographic data capture form, scales concerning ethical conduct, organisational culture and justice as well as Temperament and Character Inventory (TCI). The study was realized with the employees of two local governments in two districts in the province of Bursa in Turkey. The study found that while the average scores of those working in managing positions were statistically significant high in the dimensions of "persistence" and "self-transcendence", those employed by a sub-contractor had statistically significant high average scores in the

dimensions of "self-directedness" and "cooperativeness" ($p < 0,05$). While the average score of men in the dimensions of "novelty seeking", "harm avoidance", "reward dependence", "self-directedness" and "cooperativeness" were statistically higher than those of women, women had statistically higher average scores than men in the dimensions of "persistence" and "self-transcendence" ($p < 0,05$).

Key words: *socio-demographic data, ethical conduct, organisational culture, justice, character, temperament*

Introduction

All living beings are in need of living in, and acting together with the members of, a group or a community in order to meet their desires and needs. These communities and groups, on the other hand, need leaders to lead and direct them to achieve a harmonious co-existence and to create a community that enjoys success. The characters and temperaments of the leaders play a role of great importance in that whether or not they can, for example, empower the humans in society and achieve a flourishing community.

Increasing the performance and productivity in institutions and organisations in line with diversifying human needs is a major challenge we can only tackle through an effective human resource management. In a time of rapid changes all across the world, we need new structures and human resources created in new policies by leaders; this is the only way we will be able to stand up the challenges such an ever-changing world brings about. Every individual with varying traits in any human society as a social and open system has an effect on the existing structure, and character is the most important factor that affects such a structure.

Social scientists define character as a term that encompasses several traits such as the conducts and behaviours people should display to live in harmony with other humans, their fields of interest and abilities, ways of speaking and appearance. Psychologists, on the other hand, hold that character is the total of the specific and distinguishing attitude of an individual, including the roles an individual plays in society and the effects of these roles on other humans.

The way of behaving and past experience of an individual and the environment play a role of essential importance in the development of his/her character. As the personality traits begin to take shape in early period in one's life, one can realise his/her inborn potential when proper conditions can be provided. It is a fact that there is a significant relationship between personality traits and organisational variables such as business predictability, leadership and ways of problem/conflict solving.

METHODOLOGY:

Study Method: In this study performed in relational screening method, we used a questionnaire form including 26 questions, ethical conduct scale of five-point Likert type including 36 questions, the scale of organisational culture with 37 items, the justice scale consisting of 9 items and Temperament and Character Inventory.

Population and Sample: The study population consisted of 1002 employees of the Municipality of Yildırım comprising of 57 managers, 584 employees in permanent employment and 418 employees employed by sub-contractors, and 1555 employees of the Municipality of Osman Gazi with 61 employees in managing position, 584 employees in permanent employment and 910 employed by sub-contractors, who were selected through simple random sampling on the basis of grouping. Because the relationship between character and temperament, and leadership are important in a local government, we preferred to perform the study in municipalities. Besides, these two local governments represent 15 municipalities from among the total number of 17 municipal governments in the province of Bursa, which are governed by a party that has been ruling the country for long years now. The sample consisted of 625 employees who were present in the premises of the said institutions on the day of implementation after the consent of the ethical board was obtained, and who agreed to take part in the study and gave consent.

Questionnaire

The questionnaire consisted of 20 questions, with 16 questions capturing socio-demographic data such as age, gender, educational background, civil status, family type, work unit, work time, position and 4 questions specific to the person questioning the

negative experiences with subordinates and superiors as well as negative and positive points.

Temperament and Character Inventory

Temperament and Character Inventory (TCI) is a self-assessment scale developed by Cloninger. Cloninger developed a dimensional and psycho-biological test of personality traits intended to investigate the normal and abnormal variants in temperament and character as two basic components in 1993. Köse et al. (2004) conducted the study testing the validity and reliability of TCI in Turkish. TCI consists of 240 items in true-false response format. The temperament traits of the inventory are Novelty Seeking (40 items), Harm Avoidance (35 items), Reward Dependence (24 items) and Persistence (8 items). The character traits, on the other hand, have three dimensions, i.e. Self-Directedness (44 items), Cooperativeness (42 items) and Transcendence (33 items). All the dimensions except for persistence are divided into various subscales varying between 3 and 5, with temperament dimensions of NS with 4 subscales, HA with 4 subscales and RD also with 4 subscales, and character dimensions of SD with 5 subscales, CO with 5 and ST with 3 subscales. The measurement in the Temperament and Character Inventory is performed in that while all the items in all the subscales that are scored positive were not underlined, those scored negative are underlined (D= 0, Y= 1). Some items, on the other hand, considered as a section of TCI are not scored (Köse et al., 2004).

Cloninger C.R., Przybeck T.R., Svrakic D.M., & Wetzel R.D. (1994). The temperament and character inventory (TCI): A guide to its development and use. St. Louis: Washington University Center for Psychobiology of Personality. Department of Psychiatry, Washington University, School of Medicine.

Organisational Justice Scale: The perception of organisational justice was measured through Justice Perception Scale (JPS) including 20 questions, which was adopted into Turkish by Özmen et al. (2007) by drawing upon the model developed by Colquitt (2001). The justice scale is designed in five-level Likert style with response options " 5-strongly agree, 4-agree, 3-neither agree nor disagree, 2-disagree 1-strongly disagree". It

includes 20 questions designed to measure 4 dimensions, namely procedural justice, distributive justice, interpersonal justice and informative justice. The first dimension is measured with 7 questions, the second and third dimensions with 5, and the fourth dimension with 5 questions. The total numerical value of the scale varies between 20 and 100. Higher scores indicate higher justice perceptions. Using it in their research, several researchers provided evidence for the reliability and validity of this scale. In his initiative to develop the scale, Colquitt (2001) tested the scale in two different studies, as a result of which he found the reliability levels of 0.78, 0.79, 0.79 and 0.92 in the first study and 0.93, 0.92, 0.90 and 0.93 in the second one with respect to factors. Besides, his two studies showed that the confirmatory factor analysis yielded better results in the structure consisting of four dimensions (Colquitt, 2001; 392). The scale was used by several researchers in Turkey as well. Özmen et al., (2001), who used the scale in their study, reported that the scale items fell into three factors, finding factor reliability values of 0.94 for distributive justice, 0.86 for procedural justice and 0.88 for interpersonal justice. Aslantaş and Pakdemir (2007), on the other hand, who used the scale in a structure of four dimensions, found the overall reliability of the scale as 0.94 (Arslan 2007, Colquitt 2001, Özmen 2007)

Organisational Culture Scale: This scale developed by Kara (2006) includes four sub-dimensions, i.e. power, role, success and support, and 36 statements. Forty one factor loads in association with all these statements are high. The Cronbach Alpha Coefficient for the whole of the organisational culture scale was measured to be 0.85. The power factor has seven statements, the role factor ten and the support factor also ten statements (Kara 2006).

Ethical Conduct Scale: It was prepared by Prof. Dr. İnayet Pehlivan and developed by Kara (2006). In his study performed to test the reliability and validity of the Ethical Conduct Scale for Education Administrators, Kara (2006) first contemplated a structure with 74 items and 6 sub-dimensions, but later, in the implementation stage, he used a reduced structure with 36 items and 4 sub-dimensions. The Cronbach Alpha Coefficient of the Ethical Conduct Scale for Education Administrators was measured to be 0.94 in the sub-dimension of tolerance, 0.91 in the one of honesty, 0.91 in the sub-dimension of

justice and 0.89 in that of responsibility; the overall value, on the other hand, was found to be 0.92. A five-level Likert type scale was used to analyse the perceptions of employees regarding the ethical conduct of their superiors, with response options “ 5-strongly agree, 4-agree, 3-neither agree nor disagree, 2-disagree 1-strongly disagree” (Kara, 2006; Pehlivan, 2002).

Ethical Considerations

After the purpose and method of the research project had been specified, ethical consent under the reference number YDÜ/SB/2017/3 was obtained from the Ethical Board of Cyprus Near East University.

FINDINGS / DISCUSSION

Table 1: Personal Information about Participants (n=602)

| Personal Information | Number | % |
|------------------------|--------|------|
| Age | | |
| Aged 20-34 | 187 | 31.0 |
| Age 35-49 | 385 | 64.0 |
| Aged 50-64 | 30 | 5.0 |
| Gender | | |
| Women | 306 | 50.8 |
| Men | 296 | 49.2 |
| Civil Status | | |
| Married | 469 | 77.9 |
| Single | 133 | 22.1 |
| Family Type | | |
| Nuclear family | 538 | 89.4 |
| Extended family | 42 | 7.0 |
| Fragmented family | 22 | 3.7 |
| Educational Background | | |
| Illiterate | 9 | 1.5 |
| Middle school | 5 | 0.8 |
| High school | 417 | 69.3 |
| University | 171 | 28.4 |
| Employer | | |
| Public sector | 416 | 69.1 |
| Private sector | 168 | 27.9 |
| Others | 18 | 3.0 |
| Employing Institution | | |
| Social Services | 22 | 3.7 |
| Ministry of Education | 8 | 1.3 |

| | | |
|--|-----|------|
| Local Government | 572 | 95.0 |
| Working Time | | |
| 1-5 years | 41 | 6.8 |
| 6-10 years | 241 | 40.0 |
| 11 and over | 320 | 53.2 |
| Employment Status | | |
| Employed by sub-contractor | 335 | 55.6 |
| In permanent employment | 245 | 40.7 |
| In managing position | 22 | 3.7 |
| Whether received training for the position | | |
| Received | 436 | 72.4 |
| Not received | 166 | 27.6 |
| Mode of Work | | |
| Full time | 379 | 63.0 |
| Part time | 223 | 37.0 |
| Social Security | | |
| Retirement Fund | 141 | 23.4 |
| Social Security Agency | 460 | 76.4 |
| Green Card | 1 | 0.2 |
| Residence in Childhood | | |
| Urban Area | 384 | 63.8 |
| Rural Area | 218 | 36.2 |
| Lived for the longest time in | | |
| Urban Area | 552 | 91.7 |
| Rural Area | 50 | 8.3 |
| Negative experience with a superior | | |
| Experienced | 10 | 1.7 |
| Not experienced | 592 | 98.3 |
| Negative experience with a subordinate | | |
| Experienced | 6 | 1.0 |
| Not experienced | 596 | 99.0 |
| Reported positive trait | | |
| Successful – laborious | 57 | 9,4 |
| Emphatic | 1 | 0,2 |
| Tolerant | 1 | 0,2 |
| Not responded | 543 | 90,2 |
| Reported negative trait | | |
| Short-tempered | 10 | 1.7 |
| Not responded | 592 | 98.3 |

Table 2: Average scores of participants in the scales of ethical conduct, organisational culture, organisation justice and the subscales of Temperament and Character Inventory (TCI)

| | Average (\bar{x}) \pm Sd | Median | Maximum | Minimum |
|---|--------------------------------|--------|---------|---------|
| Ethical Conduct Scale | 101.85 \pm 21.02 | 106 | 165 | 36 |
| Organisational Culture Scale | 105.95 \pm 22.61 | 109 | 185 | 37 |
| Organisational Justice Scale | 59.93 \pm 12.75 | 54 | 100 | 62 |
| Sub-dimensions of Temperament and Character Inventory | | | | |
| Novelty Seeking | 21.28 \pm 1.77 | 22 | 22 | 17 |
| Harm Avoidance | 19.26 \pm 1.98 | 20 | 20 | 14 |
| Reward Dependence | 15.69 \pm 1.07 | 16 | 16 | 12 |
| Persistence | 6.23 \pm 2.23 | 7 | 9 | 3 |
| Self-Directedness | 28.76 \pm 4.31 | 30 | 30 | 14 |
| Cooperativeness | 21.93 \pm 0.26 | 22 | 22 | 21 |
| Self-Transcendence | 32.48 \pm 18.10 | 42 | 49 | 3 |

Table 3: Average Scores of the Participants obtained in the Temperament and Character Inventory by their Personal Information

| Personal Information | NS Average \pm ss | HA Average \pm ss | RD Average \pm ss | PS Average \pm ss | CD Average \pm ss | CO Average \pm ss | ST Average \pm ss |
|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| Age | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|
| Aged 20-34 | 19.72 ±2.61 | 17.60 ±3.09 | 14.66± 2.00 | 6.65± 2.08 | 24.66 ±8.00 | 21.66 ±0.50 | 35.87 ±14.74 |
| Aged 35-49 | 21.81± 0.96 | 19.77± 1.15 | 16.00± 0.00 | 6.14 ±2.25 | 30.00± 0.00 | 22.00 ±0.00 | 31.93± 18.95 |
| Aged 50-64 | 22.00± 0.00 | 20.00 ±0.00 | 16.00 ±0.00 | 5.00± 2.51 | 30.00± 0.00 | 22.00± 0.00 | 19.71± 20.84 |
| | KW:11.581,p:0.003<0.05 | KW:9.360,p:0.09<0.05 | KW:10.556,p:0.005<0.05 | KW:3.377,p:0.185>0.05 | KW:10.556,p:0.005<0.05 | KW:10.556,p:0.005<0.05 | KW:4.425,p:0.109>0.05 |
| Gender | | | | | | | |
| Women | 17.71 ±1.88 | 15.00 ±2.44 | 13.00± 2.00 | 7.07 ±1.46 | 18.00 ±8.00 | 21.25 ±0.50 | 41.21 ±7.27 |
| Men | 22.00± 0.00 | 20.00 ±0.00 | 16.00± 0.00 | 5.64 ±2.48 | 30.00 ±0.00 | 22.00± 0.00 | 25.68 ±20.93 |
| | Z:-5.845,p:0.000<0.05 | Z:-5.693,p:0.000<0.05 | Z:-5.264,0.000<0.05 | Z:-2.955,p:0.003<0.05 | Z:-5.264,0.000<0.05 | Z:-5.264,0.000<0.05 | Z:-2.966,p:0.003<0.05 |
| Civil Status | | | | | | | |
| Married | 21.39 ±1.65 | 19.40 ±1.82 | 15.78± 0.90 | 5.98 ±2.28 | 29.15 ±3.62 | 21.94± 0.22 | 30.49± 19.06 |
| Single | 17.00 ±0.00 | 14.00 ±0.00 | 12.00± 0.00 | 7.73± 0.99 | 14.00 ±0.00 | 21.00 ±0.00 | 42.90 ±3.59 |
| | Z:-2.449,p:0.014<0.05 | Z:-2.683,p:0.007<0.05 | Z:-3.464,p:p:0.001<0.05 | Z:-2.944,p:0.003<0.05 | Z:-3.464,p:0.001<0.05 | Z:-3.464,p:0.001<0.05 | Z:-1.722,p:0.085>0.05 |
| Family Type | | | | | | | |
| Nuclear | 21.39 | 19.40 | 15.78± | 6.09± | 29.15± | 21.94 | 32.12 |

| | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| Family | ±1.65 | ±1.82 | 0.90 | 2.26 | 3.62 | ±0.22 | ±18.29 |
| Extended Family | 17.00 ±0.00 | 14.00 ±0.00 | 12.00± 0.00 | 7.87 ±1.24 | 14.00± 0.00 | 21.00± 0.00 | 40.00± 9.16 |
| Fragmented Family | 0.00 ±0.00 | 0.00± 0.00 | 0.00± 0.00 | 7.25± 0.50 | 0.00 0.00 | 0.00 0.00 | 45.50 ±3.53 |
| | KW:6.00, p:0.014<0.05 | KW:7200, p:0.007<0.05 | KW:12.000, p:0.001<0.05 | KW:5.926, p:0.052>0.05 | KW:12.000, p:0.001<0.05 | KW:12.000, p:0.001<0.05 | KW:2.070, p:0.355>0.05 |
| Education al background | | | | | | | |
| Illiterate | 0.00 ±0.00 | 0.00± 0.00 | 0.00 ±0.00 | 8.00 ±1.00 | 0.00± 0.00 | 0.00± 0.00 | 0.00± 0.00 |
| Middle School | 0.00 ±0.00 | 0.00 ±0.00 | 0.00± 0.00 | 8.00 ±0.00 | 0.00± 0.00 | 0.00 ±0.00 | 0.00± 0.00 |
| High School | 21.32 ±1.73 | 19.33 ±1.91 | 15.65± 1.13 | 5.95 ±2.34 | 28.62 ±4.54 | 21.91± 0.28 | 29.93 ±19.12 |
| University | 21.00 ±2.23 | 18.80 ±2.68 | 16.00± 0.00 | 6.72± 1.88 | 30.00± 0.00 | 22.00 ±0.00 | 39.13 ±13.13 |
| | - | - | - | KW:2.954, p:0.228>0.05 | - | - | - |
| Employer | | | | | | | |
| Public Sector | 19.50 ±2.67 | 17.00 ±3.20 | 14.28 ±2.13 | 7.34 ±1.49 | 23.14 ±8.55 | 21.57± 0.53 | 41.07 ±10.00 |
| Private Sector | 21.84 ±0.87 | 20.00 ±0.00 | 16.00 ±0.00 | 4.60± 2.10 | 30.00± 0.00 | 22.00± 0.00 | 20.49 ±20.17 |
| Others | 17.00 ±0.00 | 14.00 ±0.00 | 0.00± 0.00 | 8.33 ±0.57 | 0.00± 0.00 | 0.00 ±0.00 | 40.00± 7.21 |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| | KW:17.325,p:0.000<0.05 | KW:21.778,p:0.000<0.05 | KW:14.476,p:0.000<0.05 | KW:45.240,p:0.000<0.05 | KW:14.476,p:0.000<0.05 | KW:14.476,p:0.000<0.05 | KW:26.537,p:0.000<0.05 |
| Working Time | | | | | | | |
| 1-5 years | 20.00±2.73 | 17.60±3.28 | 15.00±2.00 | 5.25±2.25 | 26.00±8.00 | 21.75±±0.50 | 30.66±17.61 |
| 6-10 years | 20.12±2.58 | 18.28±2.92 | 14.85±1.95 | 7.19±1.83 | 25.42±7.80 | 21.710.48 | 38.53±13.43 |
| 11 and over | 21.82±0.92 | 19.79±1.11 | 16.00±0.00 | 5.77±2.27 | 30.00±0.00 | 22.00±0.00 | 29.36±19.73 |
| | | | | KW:1.500,p:0.221>0.05 | | | KW:2.849,p:0.241>0.05 |
| Employment Status | | | | | | | |
| Employed by a subcontractor | 21.73±1.13 | 19.83±0.98 | 16.00±0.00 | 5.56±2.42 | 30.00±0.00 | 22.00±0.00 | 28.22±19.72 |
| In permanent employment | 17.00±0.00 | 14.00±0.00 | 12.00±0.00 | 7.27±1.07 | 14.00±0.00 | 21.00±0.00 | 42.72±5.69 |
| In managing position | 0.00±0.00 | 0.00±0.00 | 0.00±0.00 | 8.60±0.54 | 0.00±0.00 | 0.00±0.00 | 44.00±3.46 |
| | - | - | - | KW:18.915,p:0.000<0.05 | KW:38.000,p:0.000<0.05 | KW:38.000,p:0.000<0.05 | KW:14.538,p:0.001<0.05 |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Whether received training for the position | | | | | | | |
| Received | 21.47 1.55 | 19.51 1.66 | 15.67 1.10 | 6.04 2.33 | 28.70 4.42 | 21.91 0.27 | 30.46 19.06 |
| Not received | 19.50 2.88 | 17.00 3.46 | 16.00 0.00 | 6.86 1.71 | 30.00 0.00 | 22.00 0.00 | 40.03 11.32 |
| | Z:- 2.120,p :0.034 <0.05 | Z:- 2.402,p: 0.016>0 .05 | Z:- 0.414,p:0. 679>0.05 | Z:- 1.460,p:0. 144>0.05 | Z:- 0.414,p:0. 679>0.05 | Z:- 0.414,p:0. 679>0.05 | Z:- 1.864,p:0. 062>0.05 |
| Mode of work | | | | | | | |
| Full time | 21.42 1.62 | 19.52 1.66 | 15.68 1.10 | 6.02 2.21 | 28.72 4.43 | 21.92 0.27 | 32.70 18.37 |
| Part time | 21.06 2.01 | 18.87 2.41 | 15.71 1.06 | 6.53 2.23 | 28.85 4.27 | 21.92 0.26 | 32.11 17.81 |
| | Z:- 0.641,p :0.522 >0.05 | Z:- 1.014,p: 0.311>0 .05 | Z:- 0.095,p:0. 924>0.05 | Z:- 1.483,p:0. 138>0.05 | Z:- 0.095,p:0. 924>0.05 | Z:- 0.095,p:0. 924>0.05 | Z:- 0.489,p:0. 625>0.05 |

Table 4: The Relationship between the Temperament and Character Traits of the Participants and the Scales of Organisational Justice and Organisational Culture

| Sub-dimensions of Temperament and Character Inventory | Organisation al Justice Scale | Organisation al Culture Scale | Ethical Conduct Scale |
|---|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Novelty Seeking | r=-0,230 p=0,000 | r=-0,350 p=0,000 | r=-0,376 p=0,000 |

| | | | |
|--------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Harm Avoidance | r=-0,227 p=0,000* | r=-0,349 p=0,000* | r=-0,373 p=0,000* |
| Reward Dependence | r=-0,232 p=0,000* | r=-0,347 p=0,000* | r=-0,370 p=0,000* |
| Persistence | r=-0,174 p=0,000* | r=-0,198 p=0,000* | r=-0,176 p=0,000* |
| Self-Directedness | r=-0,232 p=0,000* | r=-0,347 p=0,000* | -0,370 p=0,000 |
| Cooperativeness | r=-0,232 p=0,000* | r=-0,347 p=0,000* | r=-0,370 p=0,000* |
| Self-Transcendence | r=-0,068 p=0,095 | -0,201 p=0,000* | r=-0,075 p=0,065 |

Personal Information on Participants

Of the participants, 4% were in the age group 35-49, and 50.8% were women and 77.9% expressed being married. On the other hand, 89.4% reported living in a nuclear family, and 69.3% expressed being middle school graduates. Responding to the items about their employers, while 69.1% said they were employed in the public sector, 95% reported being employed in a local government. As for the employment relationship, 40% said that they had been employed for 6-10 years. While 63% reported working in full-time mode, 55.6% expressed being employed by a sub-contractor. Responding to the item about the training received for the current position, 72.4% responded that they did so. An urban area was reportedly the place where 63.8% spent most of their childhood, and where 91.7% spent most of their life. The study found that 98.3% of the study subjects had not experienced issues with a superior and 99.0% with a subordinate. While 9.5% of the subjects reported being successful-laborious as their most positive

traits, 90.2% expressed no opinion in this respect. As for the most negative trait, 1.7% said it was their short-temper while 98.3% expressed no opinion.

Average Scores of Participants in the Scales of Ethical Conduct, Organisational Culture and Organisational Justice, and the Temperament and Character Inventory

The average scores of the participants in the scales of ethical conduct, organisational culture and organisational justice were measured to be 101.85 ± 21.02 , 105.95 ± 22.61 and 59.93 ± 12.75 , respectively.

As far as the average scores of participants in the Temperament and Character Inventory are concerned, the highest score was recorded in the sub-dimension of "transcendence" (32.48 ± 18.10) and the lowest one in that of "persistence" (6.23 ± 2.23).

Comparison of the Average Scores of Participants in the Scales of Ethical Conduct, Organisational Culture and Organisational Justice, and the Temperament and Character Inventory by Certain Variables

The study found a significant difference between the average scores recorded in ethical conduct scale as evaluated by age; the Bonferroni test performed revealed that the participants aged 35-49 had statistically significant higher scores compared to other age groups ($p < 0.05$). As far as the average scores by gender recorded in the ethical conduct scale are concerned, men had statistically significant higher scores (103.68 ± 23.91) than women (100.05 ± 17.58). Another result of the Bonferroni test is that the average scores of those working in the public sector recorded in the ethical conduct scale were found to be statistically significant higher than those working in the private sector or in other institutions ($p < 0.05$).

Non-married subjects had statistically higher average scores (110.03 ± 20.12) in the organisational culture scale than those married (104.69 ± 23.20) ($p < 0.05$).

The average scores of men in the organisational justice scale (62.80 ± 14.23) were found to be statistically higher than women (57.87 ± 11.15). The results of the Bonferroni test shows that participants living in an expanded family, those working in the public sector and the ones employed by a sub-contractor had statistically significant higher average

scores in the organisational justice scale. The study further showed that the participants who had received training for their work at their current employer had statistically significant higher average scores (61.02 ± 13.08) in the organisational justice scale than those who had not received such a training (56.55 ± 11.04) ($p < 0,05$).

Another result of the Bonferroni test we performed in our study is that the participants in the age groups of 50-64 had statistically significant higher average scores than the ones in other age groups in the dimensions of "novelty seeking", "harm avoidance", "reward dependence", "self-directedness" and "cooperativeness" of the Temperament and Character Inventory ($p < 0,05$).

While, evaluated by gender, the average scores of men in the dimensions of "novelty seeking", "harm avoidance", "reward dependence", "self-directedness" and "cooperativeness" were found to be statistically significant higher than those of women, women had higher scores than men in the dimensions of "persistence" and "self-transcendence" ($p < 0,05$).

The results further show that while married participants had statistically significant higher average scores in the dimensions of "novelty seeking", "harm avoidance", "reward dependence", "self-directedness" and "cooperativeness", non-married ones had higher average scores than those married in the dimension of "persistence" ($p < 0,05$).

The results of the Bonferroni test also shows that the participants living in a nuclear family had higher statistically significant higher average scores than those living in other types of family in the dimensions of "novelty seeking", "harm avoidance", "reward dependence", "self-directedness" and "cooperativeness" ($p < 0,05$).

The Bonferroni test further showed that the participants employed in the public sector had statistically significant higher average scores in the dimensions of "novelty seeking", "harm avoidance", "reward dependence", "self-directedness" and "cooperativeness". On the other hand, the average scores of those working in the public sector in the dimension "self-transcendence" and those of the ones working in other institutions in

the dimension of "persistence" were significantly higher than the scores of other groups ($p < 0,05$).

In according to the results of the Bonferroni test, employees in managing positions had statistically significant high average scores in the dimensions of "persistence" and "self-transcendence", and those employed by a sub-contractor in the dimensions of "self-directedness" and cooperativeness" ($p < 0,05$).

The average score of the participants who had received training for the positions they worked in the dimensions of "novelty seeking" (21.47 ± 1.55) and "harm avoidance" (19.51 ± 1.66) were found to be statistically significant higher than those of the participants who had not received such a training (19.51 ± 1.66 and 17.00 ± 3.46 respectively) ($p < 0,05$).

The Relationship between the Average Scores of the Participants in the Scales of Ethical Conduct, Organisational Culture Perception and organisational Justice the Average Scores in Dimensions of the Temperament and Character Inventory (TCI)

The study found a positive relationship between the participants' ethical conduct scale and organisational culture perception scale ($r: 0.414, p: 0.000 < 0.05$).

A negative relationship was found between the participants' organisational culture perception and organisational justice scale ($r: -0.271, p: 0.000 < 0.05$).

The study also found a positive relationship between the participants' ethical conduct scale and the dimension of "transcendence" of the Temperament and Character Inventory ($r: 0.471, p: 0.000 < 0.05$).

A positive relationship was also found between the participants' organisational culture perception scale and the dimension of "transcendence" of the Temperament and Character Inventory ($r: 0.379, p: 0.000 < 0.05$).

Temperament and character are inherent parts of one's personality. Research has shown that temperament and character traits acquired through socialisation, which distinguish one from other people, play an effective role on one's leadership abilities. In

today's world, there has been a shift in employees' expectations from their superiors as the most important decision-making mechanism under which they have to act. A person in managing position, who derives his/her power from the authority granted, should be equipped with certain traits in order to be able to manage in an effective way. But leadership defined as "the process of influencing the conduct of individuals and groups to reach the targets set by an organisation" finds a different meaning in the field of management.

Discussion

Nowadays, people sometimes have to work in organisations with distrustful structures without ethical values such as honesty, uprightness and respect. Negatively affected by this situation, employees lose their motivation, causing them to neglect the objectives of the organisation, which leads to an environment with shrinking productivity and job retention among employees, who, over time, begin to pursue other aims. Many researchers, who argue in favour of the structural concept, hold that one's personality is a combination of temperament, character and intelligence. These three components represent different fields in personality: while temperament rather makes biological contributions, character plays a role in social and cultural domains, and intelligence, on the other hand, regulates the related functions by contributing to the social dimension. For this reason, any work to be performed in an organisational structure should be in harmony with the traits of the person who would carry out that work. Based on the temperament and character of the study participants and their scores in respect of ethical conduct, organisational culture and organisational justice, the study indicates that men conduct in a more ethical way than women.

The study found a negative relationship between the participants' temperament and character traits of novelty seeking, harm avoidance, reward dependence, persistence, self-directedness and cooperativeness, and their perceptions of organisational justice, organisational culture and ethical conduct with respect to their managers. This result indicates that the consciousness of employees in respect of such personality traits do exert a negative effect on their perceptions of the organisational culture and justice as well as ethical conduct, reinforcing the tendency which leads to a mood that makes them

to think, with a high likelihood, that their managers do not have traits a manager must have such as an attitude favouring justice and specific culture in an organisation and ethical conduct. Research has demonstrated that persons with strong personality traits do have a strong structure in respect of leadership. Even though several publications have appeared in our country investigating personality traits and loyalty to organisation, job satisfaction and leadership conduct, there are a few studies examining the perception of organisational culture and justice as well as ethical conduct, and no research is available investigating the relationship of temperament with the organisational culture and justice, and ethical conduct.

Our study found that while persons employed in the public sector have statistically high scores in the dimensions of "novelty seeking", "harm avoidance", "reward dependence", "self-directedness", "cooperativeness" and "transcendence", those working in the private sector have high scores in the dimension of "persistence".

The study also found that there is a statistically significant high relationship between the average scores of managers working in the public sector in the dimensions of "persistence" and "transcendence" and those employed by a sub-contractor in the dimensions of "self-directedness" and "cooperativeness".

The average scores of the participants in the age group of 50-64 in the dimensions of "novelty seeking", "harm avoidance", "reward dependence", "self-directedness" and "cooperativeness" were found to be statistically significant high than those in other age groups.

The average scores of the participants who had received training for their position in the dimensions of "novelty seeking" and "harm avoidance" were found to be statistically significant higher than those who had not received such a training.

Conclusion:

It is of essential importance that any work to be performed in an organisational structure should be in harmony with the personality traits of the person who would carry out that work. In an organisation individuals who assume managerial functions

should be evaluated in respect of temperament and their perception of organisational justice, organisational culture and ethical conduct.

References:

1. Arslanta, C. ve Pekdemir, I. (2007). Dönüşümcü Liderlik, Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışı ve Örgütsel Adalet Arasındaki İlişkileri Belirlemeye Yönelik Görgül Bir Araştırma, (An Empirical Study Investigating the Relationship between Transformational Leadership, Organisational Citizenship Behaviour and Organisational Justice) İstanbul University's Social Sciences Journal, 1, 261-285.
2. Bozkaya, E. (2013). Örgüt Çalışanlarının Kişilik Özellikleri İle Örgütsel Bağlılıkları Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi: Hiyerarşik Yapısı Yüksek Bir Kurumda Uygulama (An Investigation of the Relationship between the Personality Traits and Organisational Loyalty of Employees in an Organisation) Balıkesir University, Social Sciences Institute, Department of Management Post Graduate Thesis, Balıkesir
3. Colquitt, J.A. (2001). On the Dimensionality of Organizational Justice: A Construct Validation of a Measure", Journal of Applied Psychology, 86(3), 386-400.
4. Kara, Y. (2006), "Okullardaki Örgütsel Kültürün Okul Yöneticilerinin Etik Davranışları Üzerindeki Etkisi" (The Effects of Organisational Culture in Schools on the Ethical Conduct of School Administrators), Unpublished Post Graduate Thesis, İstanbul: İstanbul University, Social Sciences Institute.
5. Köse, S., Sayar, K., Ak, D., Aydın, N., Kalelioğlu, Ü., Kırpınar, D., Reeves, R. A., Przybeck, T. R. and Cloninger, C. R. (2004). Temperament and Character Inventory (TCI in Turkish): Validity, Reliability and Factor Structure. Clinical Psychopharmacological Bulletin. 14(3), 107-131.

6. Mamatoğlu, N. (2010). Lider Davranışları Algıları ve Örgütsel Kimliklenme Boyutları Arasında Çalışanın Kişilik Özelliklerinin Düzenleyici Rolü (The Regulating Role of Employees between the Perceptions of Leaders' Conduct and Organisational Identification); Turkish Psychology Journal, 25(65), 82-97.
7. Özmen, Ö.N.T., Arbak, Y. ve Özer, P.S. "Adalet Verilen Değerin Adalet Algıları Üzerindeki Etkisinin Sorgulanmasına İlişkin Bir Araştırma" (A Study Investigating the Effect of the Value attached to Justice on the Justice Perception), Journal of Ege Akademik Bakış, 7,1, 2007, 17-33.
8. Özer, Y. (2011). Örgüt Çalışanlarının Kişilik Özellikleri İle Örgütsel Bağlılıkları Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi (An Investigation on the Relationship between the Personality Traits of Employees and their Organisational Loyalty). Maltepe University Social Sciences Institute Department of Psychology Post Graduate Thesis, İstanbul.
9. Pehlivan, İ. (2002). Yönetmel Mesleki ve Örgütsel Etik (Managerial, Professional and Organisational Ethics), Ankara: Pegem A Publishing House, 3rd Edition.
10. Şengül, C. M. (2008). Örgüt Çalışanlarının Kişilik, İş Tatmini ve Örgütsel Bağlılıkları Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi (An Investigation on the Relationship between the Personality of Employees, Job Satisfaction and Organisational Loyalty), Celal Bayar University Social Sciences Institute, Department of Business Management Doctorate Thesis, Manisa.
11. Taşdöven. H., Emhan. A., Dönmez. M. (2012). Liderlik Tarzı ve Mizaç-Karakter İlişkisi: Polis Teşkilatında Bir Uygulama (Relationship between Leadership Style and Temperament-Character: A Case in the Police Department) Journal of Management and Economy. 19. 2